

REMARKS

The objection to claim 2 has been overcome.

The objections to 5, 15, and 25 should be reconsidered. There is no requirement that the claims teach how to do something. That is the function of the specification. Reconsideration is requested.


With respect to the rejection under Section 102, it is noted that nothing in the reference, nor the office action, shows how the reference teaches "associating an indication that an advertisement was played with an identifier for a particular user." Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is requested. On the same basis, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 11 is requested.

Claim 21 calls for a watermark detector to detect a watermark included with an advertisement and to control operation of a media player in response to detection of the watermark. Nothing in the office action (nor the reference) suggests any basis to believe this limitation is taught by the cited reference.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 8, 2006



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
Trop, Pruner & Hu, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, Texas 77057-2631
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation